

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated May 6, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 8, 11, 14, and 16 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1–21, 24–26, and 28–35 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1–21, 24–26, and 28–35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,195,422 to Jones et al. (hereinafter “Jones”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 1 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “sending an initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an origination switch.” Nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner cites FIG. 3, and column 11–12, lines 56–6, as teaching this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Jones teaches that “the end office 12 places the actual dialed digits from the GAP [General Address Parameter] field of the response message in an appropriate field of the IAM [Initial Address Message] message. This number may go into the ‘redirection number’ field or the ‘original called number field.’” As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Jones does not teach “sending an initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an origination switch.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2–4, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 6 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 6 is allowable in that it recites “sending a first initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an origination switch.” Nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6, and its dependent claims 5, 7, and 32–35, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 8 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 8 is allowable in that it recites “determining whether the call is a forwarded call, wherein determining includes sending a first initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value.” Nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8, and its dependent claims 9–13, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 14 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 14 is allowable in that it recites “determining whether a call is forwarded call, wherein determining includes sending a first initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum value.” Nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14, and its dependent claims 15–19, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 20 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 20 is allowable in that it recites “sending an initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an origination switch.” Nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20, and its dependent claim 21, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 24 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 24 is allowable in that it recites “generating an initial address message based on a first telephone number associated with a call from an originating telephone station, the initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at the originating station.” Nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24, and its dependent claim 25, 26, and 28–31 are allowable over Jones.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees

required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Rebecca Goldman Rudich  
Registration No.: 41,786  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant

*Michael R. Tierney*  
Reg. No. 55,676